REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are currently being amended. Claims 2, 4-13 and 15-20 remain pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2, 4-13 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,350 to LaMaire et al. (hereafter "LaMaire"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 2 and 4 both recite "an information reduction portion which reduces an amount of the information accumulated in said cache memory based on attribute information composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of said client apparatus when said storage judgment portion judges that the information externally provided can not be stored in said cache memory." Independent claim 15 is directed to a method and analogously recites "reducing the amount of the information accumulated in said cache memory based on attribute information composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of said client apparatus when said judging step (6) judges that the information provided by said information source server can not be stored in said cache memory." Thus, independent claims 2, 4 and 15 include structure for, or a step of, reducing the amount of the information accumulated in a cache memory of the client apparatus based on profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus when it is judged that the information provided by an information source server can not be stored in the cache memory. LaMaire fails to disclose at least this feature of independent claims 2, 4 and 15.

LaMaire discloses a particular method for removing an object from a network object cache in order to create space to store a new network object not currently in cache when there is not enough free space to store the new network object (Fig. 5, col. 6, lines 6-21). Specifically, LaMaire discloses that the least-recently-used object is found and the space for

-8-

this object is freed (col. 6, lines 21-24), and further discloses other methods to make replacement choices (col. 6, lines 28-67).

LaMaire, however, fails to disclose reducing the amount of the information accumulated in a cache memory of the client apparatus based on profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus when it is judged that the information provided by an information source server can not be stored in the cache memory as in claims 2, 4 and 15. While LaMaire discloses that when there is insufficient free space in a network object cache to store a new network object, an object in the cache is identified as a replacement and removed, LaMaire does not disclose reducing the information in the cache based on the process ability of the client computer 100 that contains the cache. Even if the identification of a stored object in LaMaire as least-recently-used could be considered to be "preference information" as in the claims, LaMaire does not disclose that information in the cache is reduced based on the speed at which the client computer processes information, i.e., its process ability. Thus, LaMaire fails to anticipate or render unpatentable any of claims 2, 4 and 15.

The dependent claims ultimately depend from one of claims 4 and 15, and are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

For example, with respect to claim 5, LaMaire does not disclose "a transfer portion which transfers the information accumulated in said second cache memory to said client apparatus through said first data communication network based on said attribute information and said communication attribute information", where the attribute information is composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus. Method claim 16 corresponds to claim 5 and is further patentable for reasons analogous to claim 5.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, LaMaire does not disclose "wherein said information source server provides the information to said gateway apparatus based on said attribute information and said communication attribute information in response to the request from

said second request portion" and "wherein said gateway apparatus provides the information to said client apparatus based on said attribute information and said communication attribute information in response to the request from said request portion", respectively, where the attribute information is composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus. Method claims 17 and 18 correspond to claims 6 and 7, respectively, and are further patentable for reasons analogous to claims 6 and 7 respectively.

With respect to claims 9 and 10, LaMaire does not disclose "wherein said information reduction portion removes the information having a low priority from said cache memory, wherein the priority is determined based on said attribute information" and "wherein said information reduction portion compresses the information stored in said cache memory based on said attribute information", respectively, where the attribute information is composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus. Method claims 19 and 20 correspond to claims 9 and 10, respectively, and are further patentable for reasons analogous to claims 9 and 10, respectively.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date ___April 4, 2005___   By _____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438

-11-